METHODOLOGY

**Introduction**

We target 100 UMP campus members for our questionaire paper. Of those, 95% were students, and 5% staff. The sample size and distribution was chosen to represent 2% of the campus population. Survey administration occurred on a voluntary basis as fellows visited classrooms, offices and other campus locations. The following is a comprehensive list of campus classes in which the survey will be: 1 class of 5 falculty which is FKASA , FKEE ,FIST , FKM , FSTTP . Each class will have 19 survey for student and 1 for a lecturer. The obtained sample size just minimally approached a 2% sample, without precise accuracy.

Surveyed courses seemed appropriately cross-disciplinary but no mechanism was used to verify or optimize this goal. A simple statistical breakdown was utilized to analyze the answers on the survey, while a more complex analysis may be ideal to isolate certain populations. The fellows intend to pursue more advanced statistical analyses of these data in the future if doing so will help us move closer to our sustainability goals. Finally, some questions may have been unclear to those taking the survey, such as: “How often do you eat on campus?” which aimed to assess how often those surveyed ate in the Shaw cafeteria; and “How satisfied are you with products and services?” which may have improperly assumed all campus members were aware that food service provider.

**Procedure & Data Collection**

1st, we will meet friend from the different faculty to get the timetable of their class. Then we choose suitable time for doing our survey by referring the time table. We prefer to do survey after their class so that we were not disturb their class. The 19 student will be chosen randomly to do our questionaire. Below are the question

**Frequency of On-Campus Dining**

All survey participants were asked how often they ate food from the campus cafeteria. This was another way for us to assess how often members of the campus community choose to eat in the cafeteria.

**Satisfaction with Current Food Service**

Survey participants were asked to rate their satisfaction with current food service provider explicitly but to evaluate campus satisfaction with the food program that is currently being offered. Answers to this item will allow us to get an idea of how much improvement is needed.

**Money Spent in Cafeteria per Day**

This was the item that allowed us to assess the dominance of the Shaw cafeteria within the diets of each individual. Items addressing frequency of dining and amount of money spent (coupled with amount of money remaining on meal cards) were written to assess just how much investment our campus members have in our food service program, and in turn how much their health and lifestyles may be affected by the food served.

**Food Value Rankings**

Individuals were asked to rank the order of importance for the following food qualities: Health, Cost, Organic, Variety, and Locally Grown. This item will allow the fellows to compare the priorities of the campus population to the campus sustainability goals. It is our aim to make only the changes that address the demands of the campus members, and not to enforce our own agenda without campus support.

**Healthy Food Qualifications**

A previous survey item asked individuals to report how important “healthy” food was to them. Thus, this question was created to define what our campus members believe to be “healthy.” This also allows us to identify the connections that exist between what is perceived to be healthy and what is sustainable. Possible answers included: low-fat, low-sugar, whole grains, organic/pesticide free, fresh fruits/vegetables, unprocessed foods, no high-fructose corn syrup, and other (with a write in section to follow).

**Perceived Benefits**

Three long-answer questions were proposed on the survey, asking about the perceived benefits of organic food, locally grown food, and healthy food. These questions were to allow individuals to provide additional details about their food values.